



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,381	07/02/2001	Glenda C. Delenstarr	10010760-1	3033

7590 02/11/2003

Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Legal Department, DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
PO Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

SISSON, BRADLEY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	1634

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/899,381	DELENSTARR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bradley L. Sisson	1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2002.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 and 24-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 13-23, in Paper No. 11 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a search of Group I is coextensive with that of Group II and therefore no burden is placed upon the Office. This is not found persuasive because a search of Group II is not coextensive with that of Group I. Group I is drawn to a product, and would require a search of art related to the production of said products as well as the products themselves but would not require a search of art related to the elimination of background signals. In contrast, Group II does not require a search of art related to the production of the arrays but would require a search of art related to the elimination of background signals.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 1-12 and 24-27 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 11.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As set forth in *Enzo Biochem Inc., v. Calgene, Inc.* (CAFC) 52 USPQ2d at 1135, bridging to 1136:

To be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without 'undue experimentation.' " *Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, A/S*, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Whether claims are sufficiently enabled by a disclosure in a specification is determined as of the date that the patent application was first filed, see *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986).... We have held that a patent specification complies with the statute even if a "reasonable" amount of routine experimentation is required in order to practice a claimed invention, but that such experimentation must not be "undue." See, e.g., *Wands*, 858 F.2d at 736-37, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 ("Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation . . . However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.' ") (footnotes, citations, and internal quotation marks omitted). In *In re Wands*, we set forth a number of factors which a court may consider in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation. These factors were set forth as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. *Id.* at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. We have also noted that all of the factors need not be reviewed when determining whether a disclosure is enabling. See *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., Ltd.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1213, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (noting that the *Wands* factors "are illustrative, not mandatory. What is relevant depends on the facts.").

The art to which the invention relates, i.e., nucleic acid array art and hybridization art, has advanced to the point that certain problematic areas have been identified. In support of this position as it relates to the manufacture and use of oligonucleotide arrays, US Patent 6,077,674 (Schleifer et al.) addresses certain highly problematic areas:

While in situ synthesis is a very flexible means for producing DNA arrays, the fidelity or percentage of full-length oligonucleotides synthesized within a feature on the array is less than 100 percent. An ideal array will have only full-length oligonucleotides attached to each feature. The ideal array promotes accuracy in hybridization experiments or assays or target biological materials. If the fidelity of an in situ generated array is less than 100 percent, it typically has non full-length oligonucleotides within a feature that usually consists of shorter lengths of the correct sequence, and to a lesser degree, incorrect sequences. Typical DNA coupling efficiencies are around 97 to 99 percent for the standard phosphoramidite chemistry. For oligonucleotides that are 25 nucleotides in length, these efficiencies result in only 46 to 77 percent full-length oligonucleotides contained within a feature (0.97^{25} to 0.99^{25}). This loss of fidelity can cause chemical noise in hybridization conditions. The loss of fidelity can also lead to difficulty in interpreting the data.

Photolithography is a method used by Affymetrix in California to produce in situ arrays using procedures that are similar to those used in the semi-conductor industry. In procedure described by Fodor et al. from Affymetrix U.S. Pat. No. 5,405,783, a photo-deprotection step is used where the protecting group on the phosphoramidite is removed by exposing a photosensitive protecting group to light. Four photo masks are used to create patterns to de-protect areas of the substrate and then a nucleotide is added to these regions. This technique requires four masks for each layer of nucleotides. While this technique allows for the production of high-density oligonucleotide arrays, it is less efficient than traditional phosphoramidite synthesis chemistry. With efficiencies of about 90 to 95 percent, the percentage of full-length oligonucleotides within a feature is further reduced to about 9 to 27 percent for oligonucleotides that are 25 nucleotides long (0.90^{25} to 0.95^{25}).

Carrico, (US Patent 5,200,313) similarly identifies problematic aspects of hybridization reactions:

1. The purity of the nucleic acid preparation.

2. Base compositions of the probe - G-C base pairs will exhibit greater thermal stability than A-T or A-U base pairs. Thus, hybridizations involving higher G-C content will be stable at higher temperatures.

3. Length of homologous base sequences- Any short sequence of bases (e.g., less than 6 bases), has a high degree of probability of being present in many nucleic acids. Thus, little or no specificity can be attained in hybridizations involving such short sequences. From a practical standpoint, a homologous probe sequence will often be between 300 and 1000 nucleotides.

4. Ionic strength- The rate of reannealing increases as the ionic strength of the incubation solution increases. Thermal stability of hybrids also increases.

5. Incubation temperature- Optimal reannealing occurs at a temperature about 25 - 30 °C below the melting temperature for a given duplex. Incubation at temperatures significantly below the optimum allows less related base sequences to hybridize.

6. Nucleic acid concentration and incubation time- Normally, to drive the reaction towards hybridization, one of the hybridizable sample nucleic acid or probe nucleic acid will be present in excess, usually 100 fold excess or greater.

7. Denaturing reagents- The presence of hydrogen bond-disrupting agents, such as formaldehyde and urea, increases the stringency of hybridization.

8. Incubation- The longer the incubation time, the more complete will be the hybridization.

9. Volume exclusion agents- The presence of these agents, as exemplified by dextran and dextran sulfate, are thought to increase the effective concentrations of the hybridizing elements thereby increasing the rate of resulting hybridizations.

Further, subjecting the resultant hybridization product to repeated washes or rinses in heated solutions will remove non-hybridized probe. The use of solutions of decreasing ionic strength, and increasing temperature, e.g., 0.1X SSC for 30 minutes at 65 °C, will, with increasing effectiveness, remove non-fully complementary hybridization products.

5. A question of enablement exists with respect to use of the claimed sequences as found in Claim 22. As set forth therein, the nucleic acids represented by SEQ ID NO.1-53 are to be background sequences. However, SEQ ID NO: 8 is a naturally occurring human sequence. In support of this position, attention is directed to CAS Registry No. 240395-56-6 where at positions 172682-172705, it can be seen that SEQ ID NO: 8 matches perfectly with this human sequence. It is anything but clear as to how such naturally occurring sequences would constitute a background signal when, for example, one is assaying human sequences, and especially those that comprise chromosome 16.

6. With the claimed method placing no limitation of the number, density, length and nucleotide composition of the various hybridization features and background features, as well as on the heterogeneity of the sample that is allowed to interact with the members of the array, the skilled artisan is left to their own resources to resolve, if such is even possible, the innumerable art-recognized problems that confront artisans in the relevant art. While some experimentation is allowed for under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, the amount of experimentation that the public would have to perform is beyond that considered routine, but rather, constitutes undue experimentation, which is not allowed. Accordingly, applicant is seeking protection for an area of the art while unfairly shifting the burden of enablement from self to that of the public. Therefore, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the claims stand rejected.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 13-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. The term "stringent" in claim 13 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term "stringent" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention. Claims 14-23, which depend from claims 13, fail to overcome this issue and are similarly rejected.

10. The term "substantially" in claim 21 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention.

11. Claim 21 is indefinite with respect to what constitutes "empirically observed inactive probes."

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley L. Sisson whose telephone number is (703) 308-3978. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (703) 308-1119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9307 for After Final communications.

14. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Bradley L. Sisson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634

BLS
February 10, 2003